



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/807,070	07/05/2001	John W. Sims	39786/MEG	2377
23363	7590	06/29/2004	EXAMINER	
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP			LANEAU, RONALD	
PO BOX 7068			ART UNIT	
PASADENA, CA 91109-7068			PAPER NUMBER	
			3627	

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/807,070

Applicant(s)

SIMS ET AL.

Examiner

Ronald Laneau

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al (US 5,926,796) in view of Eleftheriou (US 5,869,826).

Walker et al teach a method of providing a communication interface (col. 7, lines 18-23) for coupling a point-of-sale (P. O. S.) system to a cash management system (col. 6, lines 46-48) for providing communication between the P. O. S. system and the cash management system (col. 7, lines 30-40). Walker et al do not teach providing software on the cash management system to

Art Unit: 3627

permit operation of the cash management system over a communication link and providing software on the P. O. S. system to permit control of the cash management system over the internet but Eleftheriou teaches a method wherein providing software on the P. O. S. system to permit control of the cash management system over the communication link (modem or wide-area network) and providing software on the P. O. S. system to permit control of the cash management system over the internet (col. 4, lines 15-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the software program as taught by Eleftheriou into the device of Walker et al because it would allow the system to perform the transaction process and therefore fraudulent's access by a user. And it is obvious that the system of Eleftheriou must use same data formats when communicating information between the cash management and the P. O. S. system as claimed because both systems need to have similar format in order to be compatible.

5. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al (US 5,926,796) in view of Eleftheriou (US 5,869,826) and further in view of Gilbert et al (US 5,953,709).

Walker et al teach a method of providing a communication interface (col. 7, lines 18-23) for coupling a point-of-sale (P. O. S.) system to a cash management system (col. 6, lines 46-48) for providing communication between the P. O. S. system and the cash management system (col. 7, lines 30-40). Walker et al do not teach providing software on the cash management system to permit operation of the cash management system over a communication link and providing software on the P. O. S. system to permit control of the cash management system over the

Art Unit: 3627

internet but Eleftheriou teaches a method wherein providing software on the P. O. S. system to permit control of the cash management system over the communication link (modem or wide-area network) and providing software on the P. O. S. system to permit control of the cash management system over the internet (col. 4, lines 15-26). Neither Walker et al nor Eleftheriou teaches providing a graphical user interface on the P. O. S. system to permit control of the cash management system over the communication link but Gilbert et al teach a cash machine system 28 over a communication link (service terminal 22) including providing a graphical user interface (col. 3, lines 16-22, fig. 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the software program as taught by Eleftheriou into the device of Walker et al because it would allow the system to perform the transaction process and therefore fraudulent's access by a user. And it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made the user interface system as taught by Gilbert et al into the combined device of Walker et al and Eleftheriou because it would provide a cash-out system for a user accessing the system interface to request cash disbursement via the communication link. And it is obvious that the system of Eleftheriou must use same data formats when communicating information between the cash management and the P. O. S. system as claimed because both systems need to have similar format in order to be compatible.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 3627

- Gatto et al (US 6,710,895) teach a compact configurable scanning computer terminal wherein the scanning terminal control electronics may also include a cash register interface for controlling a cash drawer.
- Brooks, Jr. et al (US 6,067,530) teach a cash management system that racks bills received at at least one business establishment by cashier, by amount and by time while securing those bills immediately within a drop safe upon receipt from the customer in preparation for pick up by a courier service.
- Brown et al (US 6,550,671) teach cash register and method of accounting for cash transactions.
- Cusak et al (US 2003/0120546) teach system and method for facilitating real-time web-based point of sale (pos) transactions and operations.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald Laneau whose telephone number is (703) 305-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:30am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (703) 308-5183. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ronald Laneau
Examiner
Art Unit 3627

Michael Cuff 6/25/04
MICHAEL CUFF
PRIMARY EXAMINER